
Gaviota Coast Planning Advisory Committee

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES MEETING No. 14

***Wednesday June 30, 2010
Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium***

Meeting Called to Order: By Chair Kimbell at 6:34 p.m.

1. Roll Call

GavPAC Members Present: Boise-Cossart, Bowman, Kimbell, Lloyd, McGinnis, McKenna, McNabb, Tautrim (arrived after roll at 6:45pm), Van Leer

GavPAC Members Absent: Baer, Feeney

County Staff Present:

David Lackie, Long Range Planning Division Supervising Planner

Brian A. Tetley, Long Range Planning Division Senior Planner

Katie London, Long Range Planning Division Planner

2. Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda: None

3. Administrative Briefings

Staff: Staff submitted the letter from the GavPAC regarding Coastal Commission proposed modifications to the LUDC with the Board Letter Packet in preparation for the Tuesday July 6th, 2010 hearing.

Committee: Chair Kimbell reiterated that further discussion on LUDC modifications has not been agendized for this meeting since there is not adequate time to forward additional comments to the Board of Supervisors (BOS). However, the Chair will represent the GavPAC and provide testimony at the upcoming BOS hearing on July 6, 2010 regarding the Coastal Commission's proposed modifications to the LUDC.

4. Meeting Minutes from Meeting No. 13 on June 21, 2010

Deliberations: Minutes from Meeting No. 13 were transmitted via email, separately from the Meeting Packet. Therefore the GavPAC requested more time to review the minutes. The GavPAC will consider the Meeting No. 13 Minutes at its next meeting on July 21st.

5. Discussion of Coordination with the Central County Board of Architectural Review (CBAR)

Public Comment: None

Deliberation: The GavPAC expressed its desire to coordinate with the CBAR on visual and design issues as the Gaviota land use plan progresses. The committee feels that the technical and design expertise of the CBAR would bring value to the planning process, especially in the development of residential and community design standards for the Gaviota Coast. Ideally, CBAR members could be part of a future sub-committee focusing on visual resource issues. The committee asked the CBAR representatives what County policies have been the most difficult to interpret and what policies may be deficient and could benefit from review. Bethany Clough, CBAR Chair, responded that an example is the County's policy of minimizing grading requires balancing the



topography of a site with optimum design. As a general rule, Ms. Clough stated that the CBAR prefers more flexible, open-ended policies than more prescribed guidelines.

Bethany Clough offered to begin dialog on coordination efforts between the CBAR and GavPAC with Chair Kimbell. Ms. Clough also suggested giving a presentation on the CBAR's project review process to the GavPAC at a future meeting.

6. Presentation on Streamlining the Permitting Process by Eva Turenchalk

Public Comment:

Brian Trautwein representing the Environmental Defense Center (EDC): Stated that he has extensive experience with habitat restoration. He encouraged the GavPAC to think 'outside of the box' with respect to what types of projects should be considered beneficial restoration projects, as he is concerned about non-beneficial projects being exempt from permitting. The EDC believes only 7 or 8 of the 18 practices that the NRCS considers beneficial and which are exempt from County permits in the inland area, are truly beneficial to habitat.

Deliberation: Eva Turenchalk of Turenchalk Planning Services, representing the non-profit Coastal Ranches Conservancy (CRC), presented the current work efforts on permit streamlining for beneficial restoration projects countywide. Ms. Turenchalk described the status of the goal of attempting to mirror the NRCS permit coordination process within the Coastal Zone in Santa Barbara County. The goal of this project is to streamline the permit process, remove disincentives, and create incentives for beneficial restoration projects. She stated that difficulties related to implementing restoration projects in the County results in lost grant revenue opportunities and prevents job creation. Barriers within the County's planning process deter granting agencies from awarding funding to proposed projects in the County. The project involves a proposed zoning ordinance amendment to explicitly allow for beneficial project exemptions, to mirror §15333 of the CEQA guidelines which allows for exemptions of Class IV, beneficial projects. Ms. Turenchalk will try to engage in direction communication with Coastal Commission Staff after the July 6th Board hearing regarding permit streamlining.

Chair Kimbell disclosed that he is on the Board of Directors of the CRC. The GavPAC requested the list of those 18 practices that are eligible for NRCS permit streamlining and exemptions from County permits. The committee also emphasized that good management practices should be encouraged over bad ones when conducting streamlining efforts. In addition, they recognized that safe harbor agreements would be instrumental for incentivizing beneficial projects in the County.

7. Discussion of Conceptual Planning Goals

Deliberation: The GavPAC modified, added, and deleted items from the list of planning issues for Resource Stewardship and Open Space (RSOS) and Keeping Agriculture on the Land (KAL). Staff recorded modifications to planning issues in real-time, while projecting those modifications onto a large screen visible to all meeting attendees.

A summary of the combination, addition, or removal of planning issues from the planning worksheet is listed below. Other minor changes and comments were made that are not reflected in the minutes.

- RSOS-1 *Maintain & Enhance Rural Character*. Add 'definition of rural character' to tensions. Add 'integration of wind power and energy sustainability' under tensions.
- RSOS-3 *Expanded Recreational Opportunities Should be Sensitive to Natural Setting* was changed to reflect encouraging passive recreation over active recreation. State Parks added as a stakeholder. Add 'safe harbor agreements' as a tension.



- RSOS-4 *Protect & Enhance Wildlife Corridors*. Add 'interpretation of corridors' as a tension. Stake Parks added as a stakeholder.
- RSOS-6 *Protect Cultural & Historic Resources*. Stake Parks and State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) added as stakeholders.
- RSOS-8 *Natural Resources Best Management Practices to be Identified to Minimize Impacts from Agricultural Operations*. Change the tension of 'landowner resistance' to 'landowner costs and restrictions'
- KAL-1 *Encourage Agricultural Water Impoundments* was changed to *Consider Discussion of Agricultural Water Resources*.
- KAL-2 *Encourage 'Safe Harbor Agreements' for Habitat Restoration* was changed to *Consider 'Safe Harbor Agreements' for Habitat Restoration*. A planning tool added was to develop safe harbor agreements at the County level.
- KAL-3 *Encourage Sustainable & Beneficial Agricultural Land Management Techniques and Projects* was changed to *Consider Sustainable & Beneficial Agricultural Land Management Techniques and Projects*. Add permit streamlining to planning tools. NRCS and RCD were added as stakeholders.
- KAL-4 *Expand the Utilization of Conservation Easements* was changed to *Consider the Utilization of Conservation Easements*. Add conservation easement considerations to tensions. Other Land Trusts were added as stakeholders.
- KAL-5 *Expand Opportunities for Alternative Revenue Streams on Agricultural Land* was changed to *Consider Opportunities for Alternative Revenue Streams on Agricultural Land*. Add Department of Conservation (DOC) as a stakeholder.
- KAL-6 *Expand Allowed Uses by Right on Agricultural Land* was changed to *Consider Additional Permitted Uses on Agricultural Land*. Add land use conflicts as a tension.
- KAL-7 *Allow for Multi-Generational Housing on Agricultural Land* was changed to *Consider Multi-Generational and Employee Housing on Agricultural Land*. Add estate tax as a tension. Add definition of 'multi-generational housing' and ingress and egress from Highway 101 with at-grade crossings as tensions.
- KAL-8 *Promote the Alleviation of Estate Taxes on Agricultural Lands* was removed, and will be addressed as a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for non land use issues.
- KAL-9 *Relax Permit Requirements for Structures with Agricultural Uses* was changed to *Consider Permit Requirements for Structures with Agricultural Uses*
- KAL-10 *Expand Allowed Agricultural Support Uses on Agricultural Land* was changed to *Consider Allowed Agricultural Support Uses on Agricultural Land and Consider Utilizing a Development Rights Transfer Protocol to Areas With Urban Infrastructure*
- KAL-11 *Consider Utilizing a Development Rights Transfer Protocol to Areas With Urban Infrastructure* was combined with KAL-10.
- An additional planning issue, a new KAL-11, was added: *Consider Conversion from Williamson Act Contracts to Conversation Easements*

8. Discussion of Long Term Meeting Schedule

Public Comment: None

Deliberation: None

Meeting Adjournment – 9:22 p.m.

